

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 14, 2010 has been received and considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 11, 12, and 17-20

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-6, and 11, 12, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Scolan et al. (U.S. Patent No 7,058,729) Przelomiec (U.S. Patent No. 5,805,645), Sparrell (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,448) and Kotaki (U.S. Patent No 5,276,659). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites “in response to the difference between the first network timing information and the second network timing information exceeding the threshold, communicate the first fixed code value to a second computer node to request a change in network timing information associated with the second computer node **by a predetermined fixed step value** sufficiently small to avoid loss of local synchronisation with the plurality of other computer nodes in the first network.” Thus, claim 1 provides that the first field code value requests a change in network timing information be a predetermined fixed step value. According to the Office Action at pages 6 and 7, these features are disclosed by Kotaki at column 3, lines 20-45. In particular the Office asserts that the predetermined time correction number N disclosed by Kotaki corresponds to the recited predetermined fixed step value. However, claim 1 provides that the predetermined fixed step value is the amount by which the network timing information associated with the second computer node is changed. In other words, claim 1 provides that the network timing information is to be changed **by the predetermined fixed step value**. Kotaki discloses that the time correction number N represents the **number of times** that a correction is made. In other words, the time correction N does not represent the amount by which network timing information is to be changed, and therefore cannot correspond to the recited predetermined fixed step value.

Kotaki also discloses a correction coefficient, D, referenced by the Office Action at page 7. Kotaki discloses that the correction coefficient D is based on the difference between timing

information associated with different network stations. *Kotaki*, col. 3, lines 20-38. The correction coefficient D also varies depending on N (the number of times a correction has been made). *Id.* Accordingly, the correction value D disclosed by *Kotaki* is not a **fixed** value in any manner, and therefore cannot correspond to recited predetermined fixed step value. Further, as acknowledged by the Office, none of the other cited references disclose or render obvious the above-cited features of claim 1.

In addition, claim 1 recites “in response to the difference between the first network timing information and the second network timing information exceeding a threshold, determine **a first fixed code value based on a sign of the difference between the first network timing information and the second network timing information.**” The Office Action asserts at page 4 of the Office Action that these features are disclosed by *Przelomiec* at column 6, lines 26-67. However, the cited portion discloses only that a timing separation between networks can be determined by comparing control channel codes received from the networks. There is no disclosure in *Przelomiec* that the timing separation is a fixed code value in any manner. Further, none of the other cited references discloses or renders obvious determining a fixed code value based on a sign of the difference between the first network timing information and the second network timing information, as provided by claim 1. Thus, the cited references, individually and in combination fail to disclose or render obvious at least the above-cited features of claim 1. The cited references further fail to disclose or render obvious at least one feature of each of dependent claims 3-6, 11, 12, and 17-20, at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 1. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel and non-obvious features.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the above-referenced obviousness rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 21, and 22

At page 12 of the Office Action, claims 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Le Scolan* and *Przelomiec*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 recites “an interface coupled to a first network and operable to receive a fixed code value based on a sign of the difference between first network timing information associated with the first network and second network timing information associated with a second network.” Claim 10 recites similar features. As explained above with respect to claim 1, the cited references, individually and in combination, do not disclose or render obvious “a fixed code value based on a sign of the difference between first network timing information associated with the first network and second network timing information associated with a second network.” Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or render obvious at least the above-cited features of claim 7, and the similar features of claim 10. The cited references also fail to disclose or render obvious at least one feature of each of dependent claims 9, 13-16, 21, and 22, and 17-20, at least by virtue of their respective dependence on claims 7 and 10. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel and non-obvious features.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the above-referenced obviousness rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-3797.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adam D. Sheehan/

Adam D. Sheehan, Reg. No. 42,146
LARSON NEWMAN & ABEL, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)

February 14, 2011
Date